

ISSN 1343-8980

創価大学
国際仏教学高等研究所
年 報

令和三年度
(第25号)

Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University
for the Academic Year 2021
Volume XXV

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2022・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo・2022

A Buddhist spell transliterated A Sanskrit version of the *Uṣṇīṣavijayādhāraṇī* in Uyghur and Brāhmī scripts

Jens WILKENS

Dedicated to Dieter Maue on the occasion of his 80th birthday

Abstract:

The present article is a reconstruction of the *dhāraṇī* part of the *Uṣṇīṣavijayādhāraṇī* produced during the Yuan dynasty which does not only contain the Sanskrit text in transliteration in Uyghur script but also an interlinear Brāhmī version. Fragments from different woodblock prints are taken into account. All pieces are housed in the Berlin Turfan Collection. Except for a few letters (in the transliterated text in Uyghur script) or *akṣaras* (in case of the Brāhmī part) respectively it is possible to present a complete reconstruction of the text. All fragments considered, it is now possible to draw the conclusion that the Uyghurs printed and disseminated a special edition of the *Uṣṇīṣavijayādhāraṇī* that contained only the *dhāraṇī* section. This text is directly based on a Sanskrit original although occasionally the Uyghur edition differs from the recently published critical edition of the Sanskrit text based on Nepalese manuscripts.

Keywords:

Uṣṇīṣavijayādhāraṇī, Old Uyghur, Sanskrit, Buddhist spells, woodblock prints, Turfan.

1. Introduction

During the Yuan Dynasty the Uyghurs started to duplicate Buddhist texts by the means of the technique of woodblock printing. Texts thus disseminated in large quantities are often ritualistic in content. Especially some *dhāraṇīs* were extremely popular. The *Uṣṇīṣavijayādhāraṇī* is one these ritualistic texts held in high esteem. This *dhāraṇī* is represented in the Berlin Turfan Collection by numerous fragments of different woodblock print editions. This important Buddhist spell was widespread not only in the Himalayan region but also in Central and East Asia, where versions in various languages are extant.¹ There are fifteen

¹ The visual art of the deity *Uṣṇīṣavijayā* and her *maṇḍala* are also important in Eastern Central Asia, especially when the region was under Tangut control (1038–1227). Examples are from 榆林 Yulin Cave 3 (Linrothe 1996, pl. 2 and 3; Meinert 2020, 255), from Kharakhoto (Linrothe 1996, pl. 9), and from the Eastern Thousand Buddha Cave 2, 瓜州 Guazhou (Meinert 2020, 255, 258). Especially 仁宗 Renzong (r. 1139–1193) was an “imperial propagator of the Ushnīshavijayā cult” (Linrothe 1996, 8). The emperor is most likely the patron painted into the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā maṇḍala* in Yulin Cave 3 (ibid.). For further Tangut Buddhist sites related to the cult of *Uṣṇīṣavijayā* which flourished especially in the late 12th century see Linrothe 1998, 91. In the rubble of the demolished 拜寺溝方塔 Baisigou fangta a printed Sanskrit *Uṣṇīṣavijayādhāraṇī* surrounding the image of the deity was retrieved (Linrothe 1998, 96–97). For examples of her image in printed form and other representations see Linrothe 1998, 99–102. On her various iconographies see Linrothe 1998, 99–100 and

translations into Chinese alone² and five into Tibetan.³ Chinese and Sanskrit versions of the *dhāraṇī* are engraved on “*dhāraṇī* pillars” in China.⁴ The Sanskrit *dhāraṇī* and transliterations into Tangut, Tibetan, ‘Phags pa (Mongolian), Uyghur, and Chinese scripts are found on the east wall of the 居庸關 Juyong guan gateway north of Beijing.⁵ Especially the Sanskrit text has an “imperial” quality to it.⁶

It was F. W. K. Müller who edited substantial parts of the Old Uyghur version in his masterly publication *Uigurica II* together with a corresponding Chinese text.⁷ Until recently, the *Uṣṇīṣavijayādhāraṇī* has not received the same attention in Uyghur studies⁸ as the *Sitātapatrādhāraṇī* the first edition of which is also included in Müller’s *Uigurica II*.⁹ Catalogue descriptions of fragments belonging to the *Uṣṇīṣavijayādhāraṇī* are spread over two volumes of the series *Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland* (VOHD), sometimes without identification.¹⁰ Some unpublished parallels to Müller’s edition are noted as well. In his review of the three volumes with catalogue descriptions of fragments of woodblock prints in the Berlin Turfan Collection Peter Zieme made a highly useful list of fragments he identified as belonging to the *Uṣṇīṣavijayādhāraṇī*.¹¹ He abstained from giving further information such as joins, the sequence of fragments etc. Only a few pieces can now be added to this list: these are the fragments Mainz 577, U 4022, U 6429. In VOHD XIII, 23 no. 367 it was surmised that fragments b–d of U 3902 might belong to the *Uṣṇīṣavijayādhāraṇī*. Only fragment c is definitely part of the *dhāraṇī* (on which see below), fragment b is most likely a part of the *Sitātapatrādhāraṇī* so far unknown. Although no direct join is possible, U 4418 and U 4593 belong in all likelihood to the same “page”¹² with only one character missing in the two lines remnants of which are preserved on U 4593. Then U 4508 must also belong to the same page. The small fragment U 4583 (VOHD XIII, 23 no. 244) is probably a parallel to lines **024–025**.¹³ But the correspondence poses some difficulties. Therefore the piece is not taken into account below. The damaged fragment U 4399 seems to belong to the text but on closer inspection it becomes clear that this is actually not the case.

Some fragments can now be joined for the first time while others such as U 4252a and U 4252b do not belong to the same page.¹⁴ The fragment U 4328 is torn into three pieces that are out of alignment and thus wrongly glassed. In VOHD XIII, 23 no. 128, where they are

Lokesh Chandra 1980, 129–135. As mentioned by Linrothe (1996, 6), *Uṣṇīṣavijayā* “becomes identified” in the Himalayan region “with long life and favorable rebirth”. On her association with stūpas see Linrothe 1998, 99–100.

² Lokesh Chandra 1980, 126–127.

³ Ibid., 128.

⁴ Linrothe 1998, 98.

⁵ Linrothe 1998, 98, footnote 23.

⁶ The earliest Sanskrit manuscript is kept in the Hōryūji monastery in Japan (dated 609 CE) (Lokesh Chandra 1980, 126).

⁷ Müller 1911, 27–50. In VOHD XIII, 19, p. 25 the authors state the Old Uyghur version is based on a Tibetan translation of the Sanskrit text.

⁸ But see now Uzunkaya 2018, İsi 2021, and especially Kılıç Cengiz 2021.

⁹ Müller 1911, 50–75.

¹⁰ VOHD XIII, 19 and 23.

¹¹ Zieme 2011, 226b.

¹² A “page” means a unity of five lines (in case of the *Uṣṇīṣavijayādhāraṇī*) in a folded concertina book.

¹³ Identified as a fragment of the *Uṣṇīṣavijayādhāraṇī* in Zieme 2011, 226b.

¹⁴ Erroneously joined in VOHD XIII, 19 no. 219. U 4252b corresponds to lines **03–07** in the edition below, while U 4252a is a parallel to lines **08–12**. Thus, they belong to the same woodblock print but to two different pages following each other. I assume that they belong to the double page Mainz 319/a/ and /b/ respectively.

grouped as unidentified, they are transliterated as they are placed under glass. U 4328b corresponds to lines **20–22**, U 4328a corresponds to lines **18–22** (above) thus they both belong to the same page. Fragment U 4328c belongs to line **20** under fragment U 4252a /r/3. Directly to be joined are the pieces U 4733 and U 4129 as well as U 4448/b/, U 4368 and U 4041. Although no direct join is possible, U 3902c/b/ and U 4041 belong presumably to the same page.

Some of the fragments edited below or taken into account as parallels are found in the brand new edition by Hasan İsi (2021). However, he did not make proper use of the Sanskrit text and presented the pieces from the Berlin Turfan Collection only in a very preliminary form of transliteration. The benefit of such an approach is highly questionable. Only in his attempt to present the *dhāraṇī* on the basis of U 4763 and with the help of the Sanskrit text edited by Hoernle in 1911¹⁵ did he modify the transliteration somewhat.¹⁶ Not included in İsi's edition are the additional fragments Zieme had identified in 2011. When the present article was already completed, I came across the recently published excellent edition of an almost completely preserved manuscript of the *dhāraṇī* section housed in the Museum für Asiatische Kunst in Berlin by Ayşe Kılıç Cengiz (2021).¹⁷ This manuscript is a folded book in the concertina style without interlinear Brāhmī (referred to below under the abbreviation MS UvDh). All reconstructions below were reached without knowledge of her paper. There is a significant overlap and Kılıç Cengiz already refers in some footnotes to some parallels and occasional discrepancies found in the fragments edited below.¹⁸ However, the version edited by her is different and independent from the woodblock printed editions. It represents a different recension. Also some spellings in the manuscript differ from the woodblock printed editions. For this reason, and because of the peculiarities of the woodblock printed editions I still find it worthwhile to publish these materials.

An examination of all the materials identified so far allows us to draw some conclusions as to the transmission of the *Uṣṇīṣavijayādhāraṇī* in Uyghur Buddhism. We are now in a position to determine that there were at least three different recensions. Very important in this respect is the beginning of the text. From the beginning of the work we have only few textual testimonies. But fortunately, the combined edition of the *Āryāparamitāyurjñānanāmamahāyānasūtra*¹⁹ and the *Uṣṇīṣavijayādhāraṇī* has preserved the first page of the latter (U 4763g).²⁰ The *Uṣṇīṣavijayādhāraṇī* begins in the second from last line of this page. The introductory part of the Sanskrit text is missing altogether. This only corroborates my original assumption, namely that the long *dhāraṇī* alone was transmitted as an independent text in Uyghur Buddhism in a special edition with corresponding Brāhmī characters similar to the

¹⁵ Hoernle (1911, 461) termed the language of the manuscript Ch. 0041 from Dunhuang “transmogrified” Sanskrit, i.e., written by a Khotanese scribe. Hoernle's edition comprises this manuscript and a Sanskrit text based on the edition by Müller & Nanjio (1884) and the Hodgson MS No. 77.

¹⁶ İsi 2021, 170–171.

¹⁷ Numbered III 206 (T III M 209).

¹⁸ The fragment U 405 mentioned her footnote 27 belongs to the *Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā*. U 405 is surely only a typo.

¹⁹ See for an edition of the fragments belonging to this text BT XXXVI, p. 41–121. In the later Sanskrit recension of the *Uṣṇīṣavijayādhāraṇī* it is Amitāyus who recites the *dhāraṇī* in Sukhāvatī (Linrothe 1998, 97).

²⁰ Sometimes fragments belonging to either text are glassed together (e.g., U 3902a–d, U 4628a–d). These pieces are also most likely from a combined edition of both *dhāraṇīs*. For a transliteration of the *Āryāparamitāyurjñānanāmamahāyānasūtra* part on U 4763 see BT XXXVI, p. 108–109.

Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti.²¹ Only this particular independent text shall be considered in the following. It is clearly based on a Sanskrit version. However, in the version in Uyghur script with Brāhmī characters we sometimes find repetitions of words where the Sanskrit versions on which the critical edition by Hidas (2020) is based has only a single word. This means that the Uyghurs had access to a Sanskrit version different from the one reconstructed in the critical edition (Hidas 2020). These repetitions are not noted as variants in the critical edition. They appear below in angle brackets, i.e. < > although they appear also in the Sanskrit woodblock print published in SHT V under catalogue number 1191.²² The Sanskrit version underlying the Uyghur edition corresponds to the Sanskrit text of the Juyong guan gateway in Rañjana script and also closely resembles the woodblock print from Kharakhoto (Lundysheva & Turanskaya 2017, 57–65; for the “enlarged version” from the Yuan period see also Yuyama 2012a; 2012b). The Uyghur text resembles in this respect also the text edited by Müller & Nanjio (1884, 34–35) which too has these “repetitions”. This version is made from a book containing a collection of *dhāraṇīs* made in China. The Sanskrit text of the critical edition often has a syllable *om* whereas *om* is lacking in the version in Old Uyghur and Brāhmī scripts.²³ If this is the case, this information is found in the footnotes.

There are also some spelling peculiarities. To split up consonant clusters the version in Uyghur script sometimes has epenthetic vowels inserted (e.g., <s’rv’ tyr’ylwky ’> for Skt. *sarvatrailokya*° in line 02; *pirati*° for Skt. *prati*° in lines 03, 20–21,²⁴ *piratiṣṭite* for Skt. °*pratiṣṭhite* in line 16)²⁵. Sanskrit *v* is sometimes represented by <v> in Uyghur script (e.g., s’rv’ = Skt. *sarva*° in lines 02, 08, 14, 15, 17, 20, 29, 35, 36, 37) sometimes by <w> (e.g., <sw’p’w ’> = Skt. *svabhāva*° in line 07).²⁶ Confusion of dentals occurs sometimes (<s’m’nd’> = Skt. °*samanta*° in lines 06, 42, 43). The sequence *ddh* in Sanskrit is most often represented by a voiceless and a voiced dental (<td>) in Uyghur script. In line 29 *ddh* is simplified as <d> (<s’rv’ pwt’> for *sarvabuddha*°; in Sandhi!).²⁷ The anusvāra is ignored in the Brāhmī part in U 4003 /r/2/ (*sa ha ta na* for Skt. °*saṃhatana* in line 19). For intervocalic Sanskrit *m* the Brāhmī part has the correct consonant whereas in Uyghur script *m* is represented by <n> (<s’n ’’ṣv’s’y’ntw’> for *samāśvāsayantu* in line 38). Before a consonant we find that *mām* in line 19 is spelled <m’n> in Uyghur script while in Brāhmī it is *mā*. Sanskrit visarga is usually dropped.²⁸ In line 37 omission occurs in Uyghur script while the Brāhmī part has the correct Sandhi: *pariśuddi ča* and *sarvatatagaṭa ča* vs. *pa ri śu ddhi śca* (Skt. °*pariśuddhiś ca*)²⁹ and *[ta] thā ga tā śca* (Skt. °*tathāgatāś ca*).³⁰ In line 36 the visarga is dropped in Sandhi: *pariśuddi bavaṭu* (Skt. *pariśuddhir bhavatu*). Only the MS UvDh has the correct *pariśuddir bavatu* in line 74. Sanskrit *o* is sometimes geminated in Uyghur script

21. For a list of sheets and fragments of this text housed in the Berlin Turfan Collection see Zieme 2011, 228b.

22. The woodblock printed Sanskrit text of the *dhāraṇī* D 196 (T I) in SHT V, p. 185–186 (catalogue number 1191) was probably commissioned by Uyghurs.

23. In MS UvDh the syllable is always found when lacking in the woodblock printed fragments.

24. In both instances no epenthetic vowels in the text edited by Uzunkaya (2018) and in MS UvDh.

25. Without epenthetic vowel in MS UvDh.

26. The MS UvDh line 11 with epenthetic vowel and <v>: <swv’p’v ’>.

27. In the MS UvDh line 60 <s’rv’ pwt’>.

28. This happens also in Sanskrit texts in Brāhmī script from Central Asia. See the recently published declension paradigm in Lundysheva & Maue & Wille 2021, 31 (manuscript SI 3713/1 V). The visarga is dropped systematically.

29. Only the MS UvDh line 76 has the correct Sandhi *pariśuddiśca*.

30. The correct Sandhi *sarvatatagaṭaśca* only in MS UvDh lines 79–80.

(<'wwm> for *om* in lines **02, 04**; <šwwd'y '> for *śodhaya* in lines **04, 05, 11**; <vyšwwd'y '> for *viśodhaya* in lines **05, 12**), while in lines **39–42** such a doubling does not happen in case of equivalents to *bodhaya*, *vibodhaya*, *mocaya*, *vimocaya*, *śodhaya*, and *viśodhaya*. A convention nearly always followed in Uyghur Buddhist texts in Uyghur script is that in loan words Sanskrit *mahā*³¹ appears in defective spelling in the first syllable as <mq'>. The woodblock prints of the *Uṣṇīṣavijayādhāraṇī* follow this scribal tradition. It is apparently also a convention to transliterate the anusvāra in the seed syllable *bhrūṃ* with the velar nasal in Uyghur script (<pwrwnk>) (lines **01, 04**) because we find this spelling also in the monasterial letter Ch/U 7426 (Berlin Turfan Collection) from Toyoq.³¹

2. The textual basis

In the following compiled edition of the fragments from the Berlin Turfan Collection (Depositum der BERLIN-BRANDENBURGISCHE AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN in der STAATSBIBLIOTHEK ZU BERLIN – Preußischer Kulturbesitz Orientabteilung)³² only those pieces are taken into account that belong to the version which has the Sanskrit text only. Fragments of the Old Uyghur version are not taken into account. Although some syllables are still missing, the text can now be fully reconstructed on the basis of some completely preserved pages as well as small fragments. Because many duplicates (copies from the same printing block) and parallels (editions from different printing blocks) exist, a full transcription or transliteration of all fragments would take up too much space, I decided to base the edition on the best preserved testimony taking the basic unit of five lines as a point of departure — all woodblock print editions of this text are folded books arranged in concertina style with five lines each on a single page — and to refer to variants in the footnotes. Parallels and less well preserved duplicates are found in the following table. References to catalogue descriptions (in VOHD XIII, 19 and 23) are also provided. If we cannot join small fragments it is sometimes difficult to determine whether they all belong to the same leaf because exact parallels from others leaves show that they were often made from the same printing plate.

Lines	shelf-mark	VOHD	parallel / duplicate	VOHD
01–02	U 4763/g/	XIII, 19: 233	[02] U 4628a + U 4628c/a/ ³³ [02] U 4017/a/	XIII, 23: 366 XIII, 19: 234
03–07	U 4763/h/	XIII, 19: 233	U 4628c/b/ Mainz 319/a/ + U 4252b [03–05] U 4017/b/	XIII, 23: 366 XIII, 19: 218 XIII, 19: 219 XIII, 19: 234

³¹. Zieme 1995, 2, line 4. A reedition of this letter is found under no. 89 in BT XLVI, p. 115–117.

³². I would like to thank the following two institutions for giving me the permission to publish the fragments edited below: Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften and Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Orientabteilung.

³³. U 4628c is the upper part of the line.

08–12	U 4636	XIII, 19: 221	U 4763/i/ Mainz 319/b/ + U 4252a + U 4328c U 4645 U 4418 + U 4593 + U 4508 U 3902c/a/ U 4448/a/ ³⁴ [11–12] U 4022	XIII, 19: 233 XIII, 19: 218 XIII, 19: 219 XIII, 23: 128 XIII, 19: 222 XIII, 19: 220 XIII, 23: 252 XIII, 23: 199 XIII, 23: 367 XIII, 19: 223 XIII, 23: 350
13–17	U 4763/j/	XIII, 19: 233	U 4368 + U 4041 + U 4448/b/ U 3902c/b/ + U 4002 ³⁵ [13–15] U 4005 U 4638 ³⁶ [+ U 4003]	XIII, 19: 227 XIII, 19: 225 XIII, 19: 223 XIII, 23: 367 XIII, 19: 224 XIII, 23: 364 XIII, 19: 226
18–22	[U 4638] + U 4003	XIII, 19: 226	U 4330 U 4732 U 4055 [18] ³⁷ U 4014 U 4457 + U 4020 + U 4148a + U 4026 + U 4007 U 4369 + U 4487 + U 4476 U 4328a+b	XIII, 23: 359 XIII, 23: 362 XIII, 19: 228 XIII, 19: 231 XIII, 23: 180 XIII, 19: 230 XIII, 23: 61 XIII, 23: 20 XIII, 23: 16 XIII, 23: 145 XIII, 23: 188 XIII, 23: 186 XIII, 23: 128
23–27	U 4456 + U 4556a + Mainz 96/a/ ³⁸	XIII, 23: 179 XIII, 23: 227 XIII, 23: 325	Mainz 577	XIII, 23: 333

^{34.} U 4448/a/b,/b/ is apparently from the same woodblock as U 3902c/a/,b/. Both pieces are likely to belong to two different pages. The quality of the paper seems better in case of U 3902c/a/,b/.

^{35.} It is not possible to join the fragments directly. Should they not belong to the same page they are at least copies from the same printing block.

^{36.} In VOHD XIII, 23, p. 194 it is said that U 4003 joins with U 4368, but U 4368 is only a typo for U 4638.

^{37.} Rest of the Brāhmī part also from the next line.

^{38.} Page /b/ is only the final stroke of the letter ṛ. It is not absolutely certain that this fragment really is from the same page as the other two or only a copy from the same woodblock.

28–32	U 4635	XIII, 23: 267	U 4726 Mainz 232 + U 6429 [29–30] U 4589	XIII, 23: 276 XIII, 23: 328 XIII, 23: 299 XIII, 23: 249
33–37	U 4639/a/	XIII, 23: 268		
38–42	U 4639/b/	XIII, 23: 268	[38–42] U 4004 [38–42] U 4128 + U 4298 ³⁹	XIII, 23: 365 XIII, 23: 54 XIII, 23: 118
43–47	U 4467	XIII, 19: 217	[43] U 4128 + U 4298 [43–46] U 4654 U 4733 + U 4129	XIII, 23: 54 XIII, 23: 118 XIII, 23: 361 XIII, 23: 363 XIII, 19: 229

Fragments arranged according to their shelf marks and expedition codes: Mainz 96/a/,b/ (T I μ),⁴⁰ Mainz 232 (T II Sängim Aḡis),⁴¹ Mainz 319/a/,b/ (T I), Mainz 577, U 3902c (T III 218), U 4002, U 4003 (T I D), U 4004 (T I), U 4005 (T I), U 4007,⁴² U 4014, U 4017/a/,b/ (T I), U 4020, U 4022 (T I), U 4026,⁴³ U 4041, U 4055 (label: T I 664), U 4128 (label: T II 882),⁴⁴ U 4129 (label: T II 886), U 4148a (T II D),⁴⁵ U 4252a,b (label: T II α , Xanthippe, pencil), U 4298 (T III M 246),⁴⁶ U 4328a–c,⁴⁷ U 4330, U 4368, U 4369, U 4418, U 4448, U 4456 (T I),⁴⁸ U 4457,⁴⁹ U 4467, U 4476,⁵⁰ U 4487,⁵¹ U 4508,⁵² U 4556a,b,⁵³ U 4589,⁵⁴ U 4593,⁵⁵ U 4628a and c (on backing paper: T II D 325), U 4635 (T II M 1),⁵⁶ U 4636 (T II M 1), U 4638, U 4639 (T I D),⁵⁷ U 4645 (T II μ), U 4654 (T I μ), U 4726 (T III M 225),⁵⁸ U 4732 (T III M 225), U 4733 (T III M 225), U 4763g–j.

The partly damaged version from the Juyong guan gateway was also taken into account (abbreviated as: JYG). A digital image can be accessed under the following URL:

<https://www.babelstone.co.uk/BabelDiary/2011/08/cloud-platform-at-juyongguan.html> (retrieved December 25 2021).

³⁹. The arrangement of the lines in this parallel differs slightly from U 4639.

⁴⁰. Identification: Zieme 2011, 226b.

⁴¹. Identification: Zieme 2011, 226b.

⁴². Identification: Zieme 2011, 226b.

⁴³. Identification: Zieme 2011, 226b.

⁴⁴. Identification: Zieme 2011, 226b.

⁴⁵. Identification: Zieme 2011, 226b.

⁴⁶. Identification: Zieme 2011, 226b.

⁴⁷. Identification: Zieme 2011, 226b.

⁴⁸. Identification: Zieme 2011, 226b.

⁴⁹. Identification: Zieme 2011, 226b.

⁵⁰. Identification: Zieme 2011, 226b.

⁵¹. Identification: Zieme 2011, 226b.

⁵². Identification: Zieme 2011, 226b.

⁵³. Identification: Zieme 2011, 226b.

⁵⁴. Identification: Zieme 2011, 226b.

⁵⁵. Identification: Zieme 2011, 226b.

⁵⁶. Identification: Zieme 2011, 226b.

⁵⁷. Identification: Zieme 2011, 226b.

⁵⁸. Identification: Zieme 2011, 226b.

This version is virtually identical to the Turfan woodblock prints. Even the spellings match. In 2018 Uğur Uzunkaya edited the fragment U 2378a from the Berlin Turfan Collection which on the verso explains most phrases of the Sanskrit *dhāraṇī* in Uyghur words. If variant spellings occur, they are given in the footnotes as well in transliteration. If a genuine variant is found in the text, this is noted in transcription.

3. Technical remarks

The conventions follow the rules applied in Turkic studies.⁵⁹

italics damaged letters or akṣaras

/ illegible letter or (part of an) akṣara

[] restored letters or akṣaras (only in the transcription)

{ } letters or akṣaras to be deleted by emendation

< > additional Sanskrit words not found in the critical edition (Hidas 2020); also for transliterations in Uyghur script when the spellings are significant

/a/, /b/ etc. in a concertina-style folded woodblock print (numbers of individual pages; to be distinguished from letters a, b, c etc. referring to individual fragments glassed together)

+ fragments to be joined

JYG version from the 居庸關 Juyong guan gateway

MS UvDh (with line number; this is the manuscript edited in Kılıç Cengiz 2021)

(R) romanization of the Uyghur part

(T) transliteration of the Uyghur part

(Br) Brāhmī part

(Skt.) underlying Sanskrit text (slightly modified)

4. Compiled edition⁶⁰

In the following compiled edition, the first line (R) presents the text in Uyghur script in transcription, the second line in transliteration (T), the third line reproduces the interlinear Brāhmī part (Br), while the fourth line is a tentative reconstruction of the Sanskrit text underlying the Uyghur edition in two scripts (Skt.). With respect to the critical edition of the Sanskrit text, omissions and additions are noted as well as significant variants.

U 4763/g/

01 04⁶¹

(R) oom buruṇ svaha :

(T) 'wwm pwrwnk sv'q' :

(Br) o-m bhruṇ svā hā

⁵⁹. When quoting from SHT V, however, I use the conventions applied there.

⁶⁰. Chinese paginations are not taken into account. Digital images of all fragments are accessible via the “Digitales Turfan-Archiv” (turfan.bbaw.de/dta/).

⁶¹. As this line missing in the JYG inscription I initially thought that it might not belong to the beginning of the *Uṣṇīṣavijayādhāraṇī*. But as it features also in line 1 of MS UvDh as well, it can be regarded as an integral part. As observed in Kılıç Cengiz 2021, 663, footnote 53, this line is missing in the Tibetan and Chinese parallels.

(Skt.) om bhrūṃ svāhā

02 05

(R) oom namo bagavate sarvatirailokya

(T) 'wwm n'mw p'k'v'ty s'rv' tyr'ylwky⁶²

(Br) o-m na⁶³ mo bha ga va te sa rva tr/ lo kya

(Skt.) om namo bhagavate sarvatrailokya-

U 4763/h/

03 01

(R) piratīviśiṣṭāya budaya⁶⁴ te⁶⁵ nama

(T) pyr'dy vyṣyṣṭ'y⁶⁶ pwd'y ' ty n'm'

(Br) pra ti vi śi ṣṭā ya bu ddhā ya⁶⁷ te na⁶⁸ ma

(Skt.) prativīśiṣṭāya buddhāya te namaḥ

04 02

(R) tadyaṭa oom buruṇ buruṇ buruṇ⁶⁹ šooday-

(T) t'ty'd' 'wwm pwrwnk pwrwnk pwrwnk šwwd'y

(Br) ta dya thā o-m *bhrum*⁷⁰ bhrum⁷¹ bhrum⁷² šo dha ya

(Skt.) tadyathā om bhrūṃ bhrūṃ bhrūṃ śodhaya

05 03

(R) a šoodaya⁷³ višoodaya višoodaya⁷⁴

(T) ' šwwd'y ' vyšwwd'y ' vyšwwd'y '

(Br) šo dha ya vi šo dha ya vi šo dha ya

(Skt.) <śodhaya> viśodhaya <viśodhaya>⁷⁵

06 04

(R) asamasamanṭa-avabaṣasiparanagaṭi⁷⁶

(T) ''s'm' s'm'nd'⁷⁷ ''v'p'z ' syp'r'n'⁷⁸ k'dy⁷⁹

(Br) a sa ma sa ma ntā va⁸⁰ bhā⁸¹ sa spha ra⁸² ṇa ga ti

⁶². Only <tyr'ylwky> (without <s'rv'>) in Uzunkaya 2018, 228, line 16.

⁶³. The akṣara is completely deformed in U 4017/a/ /r/1.

⁶⁴. Note the simplification of the dentals. Different spelling <pwtd'y '> in MS UvDh line 04.

⁶⁵. Obviously the variant [*baga*]/*vate* in Uzunkaya 2018, 228, line 17.

⁶⁶. <pr'ty vyṣyṣṭ'y '> in Uzunkaya 2018, 228, lines 16–17; <pr'ty vyṣyṣṭ'y '> in MS UvDh 03–04.

⁶⁷. Part of the ink flaked off.

⁶⁸. The form resembles a *va*.

⁶⁹. Only twice *buruṇ buruṇ* in MS UvDh line 06.

⁷⁰. The akṣara is damaged.

⁷¹. The akṣara is partly damaged.

⁷². This is the only fully preserved akṣara of the three repeated syllables.

⁷³. *šoodaya šoodaya* is not explained in the text edited in Uzunkaya 2018, 228, line 19. Instead we find an addition in the Uyghur text.

⁷⁴. With single vowels <šwd'y ' šwd'y ' vyšwd'y ' vyšwd'y '> in MS UvDh lines 07–08.

⁷⁵. *śodhaya śodhaya viśodhaya viśodhaya* also in Müller & Nanjio 1884, 35 and damaged also in SHT V, no. 1191 line 2.

⁷⁶. Uzunkaya 2018, 228, lines 20 and 21: *samasamanta-avabahasamarana g(a)ti-* (with an Uyghur explanation before *g(a)ti-*). The reading *sama*^o also in Müller & Nanjio 1884, 9 and Hoernle 1911, 461, line 3 (reduplicated).

⁷⁷. Spelled <s'm'nt'> in MS UvDh line 09.

⁷⁸. <...lyp'r'n'> in Mainz 319/a/ + U 4252b /r/4.

⁷⁹. <k'ty> in MS UvDh line 11.

⁸⁰. Not enough ink was applied during printing.

⁸¹. Because not enough ink was applied during printing, the vowel is hardly recognisable.

⁸². This akṣara looks like two dots placed on top of each other with a very small connecting line.

(Skt.) asamasamantāvabhāsaṣpharaṇagati-
07 06
(R) gaganaswabawaviśuddhe abhiśāntu
(T) k'k'n⁸³ sw'p'w⁸⁴ vyśwtdy⁸⁵ 'pyśynč'ndw⁸⁶
(Br) ga ga na sva bhā va vi śu ddhe a bhi ši űca ntu
(Skt.) gaganasvabhāvaviśuddhe⁸⁷ abhiśāntu

U 4636⁸⁸

08 01

(R) man sarvatatagaṭa sugaṭavara
(T) m'n s'rv' t't'k'd' swk'd' v'r⁸⁹
(Br) mā sa rva ta thā ga tā su ga ta va ra
(Skt.) māṃ sarvatathāgaṭaḥ sugatavara-

09 02

(R) vačana-amirta-abhiśikayir m(a)hamudira-
(T) v'č'n' 'myrt' 'pyśyk'yyr⁹⁰ mq' mwdyr '
(Br) va ca nā mṛ tā bhi ši⁹¹ kai ma hā mu drā
(Skt.) vacanāmṛtābhiṣekair mahāmudrā-

10 03

(R) maṇṭirapadai ahara ahara mama-⁹²
(T) m'ndyr⁹³ p'd'y 'q'r ' 'q'r ' m' m'
(Br) ma ntra pa dai ā ha ra ā ha ra ma mā
(Skt.) mantrapadaiḥ⁹⁴ āhara <āhara mama->⁹⁵

11 04

(R) ayur sandarani šoodaya šoodaya
(T) 'ywr s'nd'r'ny⁹⁶ šwwd'y ' šwwd'y⁹⁷
(Br) yu sa ndhā raṇi śo dha ya⁹⁸ śo dha ya

^{83.} <k'q'n'> in Uzunkaya 2018, 228, line 21. This reading reflects Skt. °gahana° which is recorded in Müller & Nanjio 1884, 9 and Hoernle 1911, 461, line 3.

^{84.} <swv'p'v '> in MS UvDh line 11.

^{85.} Only the rest <šwt> preserved in Uzunkaya 2018, 228, line 22.

^{86.} With diacritics on the <š> in the JYG version. <'pyśynč'tw> in Uzunkaya 2018, 228, line 22. Then follows m[an] (overlooked by Uzunkaya). MS UvDh lines 12–13: <'pyśynč'n'tw>. Ch. 0041 (line 3) (ed. Hoernle 1911, 461): *abaśaicañtū*.

^{87.} The Sanskrit text of the critical edition has additionally *uśñīṣavijayāpariśuddhe*. Here the Uyghur version tallies with the text in Müller & Nanjio 1884, 35 again where *uśñīṣavijayāpariśuddhe* is missing too.

^{88.} As this duplicate is slightly better preserved than U 4763/i/ it is taken into account in the edition.

^{89.} <vr'> in Uzunkaya 2018, 228, line 23.

^{90.} With diacritics on the letter <š> in the JYG version and in MS UvDh line 16.

^{91.} še in Mainz 319 /r/7/.

^{92.} Not in the Skt. version.

^{93.} <m'ntyr '> in MS UvDh line 17.

^{94.} In the Skt. version additionally: *om*. Also the MS UvDh line 18 has *oom*.

^{95.} Again these words are found in Müller & Nanjio 1884, 35 and in SHT V, no. 1191 lines 4–5.

^{96.} In U 3902c: <s'nd'r'ny>. <'yw s'nt'r[...> in Uzunkaya 2018, 228, line 24.

^{97.} <šwwd'y '> in Mainz 319/b/ + U 4252a + U 4328c /r/4/ and in U 4645 /r/4/ (twice). With single vowels <šwd'y ' šwd'y ' vyšwd'y ' vyšwd'y '> in MS UvDh lines 20–22.

^{98.} This akṣara completely deformed on U 4022 /r/1/.

(Skt.) āyuhṣaṃdhāraṇi śodhaya <śodhaya>⁹⁹

12 05

(R) viśoodaya viśoodaya gaganasuvabawa

(T) vyšwwd'y 'vyšwwd'y '¹⁰⁰ k'k'n' swv'p'w '¹⁰¹

(Br) vi śo dha ya vi śo dha ya ga ga na sva bhā va

(Skt.) viśodhaya <viśodhaya>¹⁰² gaganasvabhāva-

U 4763/j/

13 01

(R) viśudde uṣṇīṣavičayapariśudde saha-

(T) vyšwtdy¹⁰³ 'wšnyš '¹⁰⁴ vyč'y 'p'ryšwtdy¹⁰⁵ s'q'

(Br) vi śu ddhe u ṣṇī ṣa vi ja ya par i śu ddhe sa ha

(Skt.) viśuddhe¹⁰⁶ uṣṇīṣavijayapariśuddhe saha-

14 02

(R) siraraśmisančodite sarvatatagaṭa-

(T) syr' r'šmy¹⁰⁷ s'nčwdydy¹⁰⁸ s'rv' t't'k'd'

(Br) sra ra śmi sa ṇco di te sa rva ta thā ga tā

(Skt.) sraraśmisaṃcodite sarvatathāgatā-

15 03

(R) avalokini śatparamitaparipurani sarva-

(T) ''v'lwkyny š't¹⁰⁹ p'r'myt¹¹⁰ p'rypwr'ny s'rv'

(Br) va lo ki ni ṣa tṣā¹¹¹ ra mi tā¹¹² pa ri pū ra ṇi sa rva

(Skt.) valokini¹¹³ śatpāramitāparipūrāṇi sarva-

16 04

(R) tatagaṭamate ḍaṣabumipiratiṣṭite¹¹⁴

(T) t't'k'd' m'ty t'š '¹¹⁵ pwmy pyr'tyšdyty¹¹⁶

⁹⁹. śodhaya śodhaya in Müller & Nanjio 1884, 9.

¹⁰⁰. In both instances of <vyšwwd'y '> the second <w> was apparently corrected from a wrong <t> (also in the duplicate U 4763/i/ /r/5). This reading <vyšwtd'y '> is preserved in U 3902c /r/5/.

¹⁰¹. <swv'p'v 'swv'p'v '> in MS UvDh line 22–23.

¹⁰². śodhaya śodhaya viśodhaya viśodhaya also in Müller & Nanjio 1884, 35 and damaged also in SHT V, no. 1191 line 5.

¹⁰³. <vyšwtdy> in MS UvDh line 23.

¹⁰⁴. <'wšnyš '> in MS UvDh line 24.

¹⁰⁵. <p'ryšwtdy> in MS UvDh line 25.

¹⁰⁶. °viśuddha in Müller & Nanjio 1884, 35.

¹⁰⁷. Without diacritics on the letter <š> in U 4593 + U 4508 + U 4448 + U 4368 + U 4041 /r/7. Also with diacritics in U 3902c /r/7/, U 4005 /r/2/ and U 4638 + U 4003 /r/2/.

¹⁰⁸. <s'nčwdydy> in MS UvDh line 26.

¹⁰⁹. <š'd> in U 3902c /r/8/. Without diacritics on the letter <š> on U 4593 + U 4508 + U 4448 + U 4368 + U 4041 /r/8/.

¹¹⁰. In U 4002 /r/3/ <p'r'myt>. Apparently the woodblock was corrected by a specialist.

¹¹¹. The reading *dpā* is not excluded though less likely.

¹¹². In U 4002 /r/3/ the akṣara *tā* was corrected on the woodblock from former *ti*.

¹¹³. °avalokiti in Müller & Nanjio 1884, 35.

¹¹⁴. °puratiṣṭite in U 4593 + U 4508 + U 4448 + U 4368 + U 4041 /r/9/.

¹¹⁵. Without diacritics on the letter <š> in U 4593 + U 4508 + U 4448 + U 4368 + U 4041 /r/9/ and in MS UvDh line 30.

¹¹⁶. <pr'tyšdyty> in MS UvDh line 31.

(Br) ta thā ga ta mā te da śa bhū¹¹⁷ mi pra ti ṣṭhi te
 (Skt.) tathāgatamāte daśabhūmipraṭiṣṭhite
17 03
 (R) sarvatatagaṭahiriḍaya-aḍiṣṭana
 (T) s'rv' t't'k'd' qyryt'y '¹¹⁸ ''tyṣḍ'n'
 (Br) sa rva ta thā¹¹⁹ ga ta hr da yā dhi¹²⁰ ṣṭhā nā
 (Skt.) sarvatathāgatahṛdayādhiṣṭhānā-

[U 4638] + U 4003

18 06

(R) aḍiṣṭite¹²¹ mudire¹²² mudire m(a)hamudir[e]
 (T) ''tyṣḍydy mwdyr y mwdyr y mq'¹²³ mwdyr []
 (Br) dhi ṣṭhi te mu¹²⁴ dre mu¹²⁵ dre ma hā¹²⁶ mu []
 (Skt.) dhiṣṭhite mudre mudre mahāmudre

19 07

(R) v(a)čirakayasanhatana¹²⁷ pariśudde
 (T) včyr ' k'y ' s'nq' t'n' p'ryṣwtdy
 (Br) va jra kā ya sa ha ta na pa ri śu []
 (Skt.) vajrakāyasaṃhatana pariśuddhe

20 08

(R) sarvakarma-avarana viśudde pirat[i-]
 (T) s'rv' k'rm' ''v'r'n' vyṣwtdy pyr't[]
 (Br) sa rva ka rmā va ra ṇa vi śu ddhe pra ti
 (Skt.) sarvakarmāvaraṇa viśuddhe prati-

21 09

(R) nivartaya¹²⁸ mama ayur viśudde s[arva]-¹²⁹
 (T) nyv'rd'y ' m'm' ''ywr vyṣwtdy s[]
 (Br) ni va rta ya ma mā yu vi śu ddhe s[]¹³⁰
 (Skt.) nivartaya mamāyurviśuddhe sarva-

22 10

^{117.} In U 4002 /r/4/ the vowel of the akṣara very clumsily placed and hardly discernible.

^{118.} <qyry///> in U 3902c /r/10/. U 4002 /r/5/: <qyryt'y '>. The latter spelling also in MS UvDh line 32 (in the edition read <qyryt'yy '>).

^{119.} The long vowel hardly visible.

^{120.} *ti* in U 4002 /r/5/.

^{121.} MS UvDh line 34 continues with *oom* here. This matches the critical edition of the Sanskrit text.

^{122.} *mudure* in U 4457 + U 4020 + U 4148a + U 4026 + U 4007 /r/1/.

^{123.} With diacritics in U 4457 + U 4020 + U 4148a + U 4026 + U 4007 /r/1/.

^{124.} The vowel only barely visible.

^{125.} The vowel only slightly more distinct than in the preceding word. In U 4014 /r/1/ *mu* is deformed beyond recognition.

^{126.} *ha* in U 4732 /r/1/.

^{127.} MS UvDh lines 35–37: *v(a)čire v(a)čire m(a)hav(a)čire v(a)čirakayasanhata* (in the edition: *v(a)čirekayasanhata*).

^{128.} *pratinivartaya* in MS UvDh lines 40–41.

^{129.} *sarva-* preserved in U 4330 /r/4/, in U 4732 /r/4/, and in MS UvDh line 42.

^{130.} *sa rva* preserved in U 4330 /r/4/ and in U 4732 /r/4/.

- (R) tatagaṭasamaya-aḍiṣṭana-aḍiṣṭ[ite]¹³¹
 (T) t't'k'd' s'm'y ' ' 'tyṣḍ'n¹³² ' 'tyṣḍ[]
 (Br) ta thā ga ta sa ma yā dhi ṣṭhā nā dhi ṣṭhi []¹³³
 (Skt.) tathāgatasamayādhiṣṭhānādhiṣṭhite

U 4456 + U 4556a¹³⁴ + Mainz 96/a/

23 01

- (R) om¹³⁵ m[un]i¹³⁶ muni¹³⁷ vimuni vimuni
 (T) 'wm m[]y mwny vymwny vymwny U 4456 /r/1/ + U 4556a /r/1/ + Mainz 96/a/ /r/1/
 (Br) o-m []¹³⁸ ni mu []¹³⁹ vi mu ni vi mu ni U 4456 /r/1/ + U 4556a /r/1/ + Mainz 96/a/ /r/1/
 (Skt.) om muni¹⁴⁰ <muni>¹⁴¹ vimuni <vimuni>

24 02

- (R) m(a)havimuni [mati m(a)hama]ti¹⁴² mamati¹⁴³
 (T) mq' vymwny []ty m'm'ty U 4456 /r/2/ + U 4556a /r/2/ + Mainz 96/a/ /r/2/
 (Br) ma hā¹⁴⁴ vi mu ni []¹⁴⁵ ti ma ma ti U 4456 /r/2/ + U 4556a /r/2/ + Mainz 96/a/ /r/2/
 (Skt.) mahāvimuni mati mahāmati mamati¹⁴⁶

25 03¹⁴⁷

- (R) sumati¹⁴⁸ tatagaṭa¹⁴⁹ [buṭa]koṭi¹⁵⁰ pariśuddhe
 (T) swm'ty t't'k'd' [] kwdy p'ryṣwtdy U 4456 /r/3/ + Mainz 96/a/ /r/3/
 (Br) su ma ti / []¹⁵¹ thā ga []¹⁵² ṭi pa ri śu ddhe U 4456 /r/3/ + Mainz 96/a/ /r/3/
 (Skt.) sumati tathāgata¹⁵³ bhūtakotiṭipariśuddhe

26 04

- (R) viṣṭa buddi ṣuḍde¹⁵⁴ he he čaya

131. Completely preserved in U 4330 /r/5/, U 4732 /r/5/, and in MS UvDh line 44.

132. Without diacritics in MS UvDh line 44.

133. ...] ṣṭhā nā dhi ṣṭhi te preserved in U 4330 /r/5/.

134. A small fragment (U 4556b) ...]ṣw[... over the second line but actually belonging to line 04! As the first line of this tiny piece has only the trace of a letter this is not taken into account.

135. oom in Mainz 577 /r/1/ and in MS UvDh line 45.

136. Preserved in Mainz 577 /r/1/ and in MS UvDh line 45.

137. MS UvDh lines 45–46 additionally: m(a)hamuni.

138. mu preserved in Mainz 577 /r/1/.

139. ni preserved in Mainz 577 /r/1/.

140. The Sanskrit text follows the variant which does not have mahāmuni as in the main text of the critical edition (endnote 105 in Hidas 2020).

141. The text in Müller & Nanjio 1884, 35 too has muni muni, but this is followed by mahāmuni vimuni vimuni mahāmuni. The dhāraṇī proper ends here.

142. Preserved on U 4457 + U 4020 + U 4148a + U 4026 + U 4007 /r/7/. MS UvDh lines 47–48 has mati mati.

143. MS UvDh lines 49–50: mamati mamati m(a)ha[ma]mati.

144. The vowel hardly distinct.

145. ma ti m[... preserved in U 4457 + U 4020 + U 4148a + U 4026 + U 4007 /r/7/.

146. The underlying Sanskrit text was different in this line. But it is difficult to predict which word was missing.

147. Only the faintest trace of a letter in U 4556a /r/3/.

148. MS UvDh lines 50–51: sumati [sumati] m(a)hasumati.

149. In edition of MS UvDh line 52: [tataṭa] because of parallels in other languages.

150. buṭakoṭi preserved in U 4457 + U 4020 + U 4148a + U 4026 + U 4007 /r/8/ and MS UvDh line 52.

151. ta preserved in Mainz 577 /r/3/.

152. ...] tā bhū ta ko [... preserved in U 4457 + U 4020 + U 4148a + U 4026 + U 4007 /r/8/ (first akṣara damaged but more or less readable).

153. Variant tathāgata in endnote 107 in Hidas' edition (testimonies ABCDEFGHI).

154. In MS UvDh line 54 follows oom. The critical edition of the Sanskrit text too has om.

- (T) **vyspwd' pwtidy šwtdy¹⁵⁵ qy qy č'y ' U 4456 /r/4/ + U 4556b /r/2/ + Mainz 96/a/ /r/4/**
 (Br) **vi sphu *tha* bu ddhi¹⁵⁶ śu ddhe he he ja ya U 4456 /r/4/ + U 4556b /r/2/ + Mainz 96/a/ /r/4/**
 (Skt.) vispuṭha buddhi śuddhe he he jaya
27 05
 (R) *čaya vič[ay]a vičaya¹⁵⁷ simara*
 (T) *č'y / /yč[]/ vyč'y ' sym'r ' U 4456 /r/5/ + Mainz 96/a/ /r/5/*
 (Br) *ja ya v/ j/ ya¹⁵⁸ vi ja ya sma ra U 4456 /r/5/ + Mainz 96/a/ /r/5/*
 (Skt.) jaya vijaya <vijaya> smara

U 4635¹⁵⁹

28 01

- (R) *simara¹⁶⁰ sipara sipara siparaya*
 (T) *sym'r ' syp'r ' syp'r ' syp'r'y ' U 4456 /r/5/ + Mainz 96/a/ /r/5/*
 (Br) *sma ra spha ra spha ra sphā ra ya*
 (Skt.) smara sphara <sphara> sphāraya

29 02

- (R) *siparaya sarvabuda-aḍiṣṭana-aḍiṣ-¹⁶¹*
 (T) *syp'r'y ' s'rv' pwd'¹⁶² ''tyšd'n'¹⁶³ ''tyš*
 (Br) *sphā ra ya sa va¹⁶⁴ bu ddhā dhi ṣṭhā nā di ṣṭhi*
 (Skt.) <sphāraya>¹⁶⁵ sarvabuddhādhiṣṭhānādiṣ-

30 03

- (R) *ṭite¹⁶⁶ šuḍde šuḍde buḍde buḍde v(a)čire*
 (T) *dyty šwdty šwdty¹⁶⁷ pwdty pwdty včyr y*
 (Br) *te śu ddhe śu ddhe bu ddhe bu ddhe va jr[]¹⁶⁸*
 (Skt.) ṭhite śuddhe <śuddhe> buddhe <buddhe>¹⁶⁹ vajre

31 04

- (R) *v(a)čire m(a)hav(a)čire suv(a)čire v(a)čira-*
 (T) *včyr y mq' včyr y sw včyr y včyr ' U 4456 /r/5/ + Mainz 96/a/ /r/5/*
 (Br) *va jre ma hā va jre su¹⁷⁰ va jre va jra*

^{155.} Letter <š> with diacritics in MS UvDh line 54.

^{156.} *ddhe* in Mainz 577 /r/4/.

^{157.} In MS UvDh line 57 follows additionally: *sara sara*.

^{158.} All akṣaras preserved in Mainz 577 /r/5/.

^{159.} An exact parallel to U 4726. In U 4635 we can observe that most mistakes were corrected and some diacritics were added. Thus U 4635 seems to be an improved later print.

^{160.} In MS UvDh line 57 *simara* only once.

^{161.} The ink is slightly blurred at the end of the word. *sarvabuda-aḍiṣṭana{a}-aḍuṣ-* in U 4726 /r/2/. No diacritics in °*aḍiṣṭana{a}*°.

^{162.} <pwdt'> in MS UvDh line 60.

^{163.} The letter <š> without diacritics in MS UvDh lines 60–61.

^{164.} A mistake for *sa rva* as in the parallels U 4726 /r/2/ and Mainz 232 + U 6429 /r/2/.

^{165.} *smara smara sphara sphara* in SHT V, no. 1191 line 12.

^{166.} Then follows *oom* in MS UvDh line 62 (*om* in the critical edition of the Sanskrit text).

^{167.} In this and the preceding word no diacritics in the parallel U 4726 /r/3/. No diacritics also in MS UvDh line 62.

^{168.} Akṣara completely preserved in U 4726 /r/3/ and in Mainz 232 + U 6429 /r/3/.

^{169.} SHT V, no. 1191 line 13 *śuddhi śuddhi buddhi buddhi*.

^{170.} Here the correct sibilant.

(Skt.) <vajre> mahāvajre suvajre¹⁷¹ vajra-
32 05
(R) garbe čayagarbe vičayagarbe v(a)čir-
(T) k'rpý č'y ' k'rpý vyč'y ' k'rpý včyr
(Br) ga rbhe cā ya ga rbhe vi ja¹⁷² ya ga rbhe va jra
(Skt.) garbhe jayagarbhe vijayagarbhe vajra-

U 4639/a/

33 01
(R) ačuvalagarbe v(a)čira-uḍbave v(a)č[ira-]¹⁷³
(T) ' čwv'l' k'rpý včyr ' 'wtp'vy v/[]
(Br) jvā la ga rbhe v/ jro dbh// ve /[]
(Skt.) jvālāgarbhe vajrodbhave vajra-
34 02
(R) sam[ba]ve v(a)čire v(a)čirini v(a)čiram bavaṭu
(T) s'm[]vy¹⁷⁴ včyr y včyryny včyr'm p'v'tw
(Br) sa mbha ve va jre va jri ṇi va jra // ¹⁷⁵ ba wā []
(Skt.) sambhave vajre vajriṇi vajraṃ bhavatu

35 03
(R) mama śariram sarvasatvananča kaya-
(T) m'm' ś'ryr'm¹⁷⁶ s'rv' s'tv'n'nč'¹⁷⁷ k'y '
(Br) ma ma śa ri raṃ sa rva sa tvā nā ṇca kā ya¹⁷⁸
(Skt.) mama śarīraṃ sarvasattvānāṃ ca kāya-

36 04
(R) pariśuddi¹⁷⁹ bavaṭu me¹⁸⁰ sadā¹⁸¹ sarvagaṭi
(T) p'ryšwtdy p'v'dw¹⁸² my s'd' s'rv'¹⁸³ k'dy¹⁸⁴
(Br) pa ri śu ddhe ta¹⁸⁵ va tu me sa dā sa rva ga ti
(Skt.) pariśuddhir bhavatu *me *sadā sarvagati-

37 05

^{171.} According to testimony F in Hidas endnote 117.

^{172.} In the parallels U 4726 /r/5/ and Mainz 232 + U 6429 /r/5/ a rather clumsy *cā*.

^{173.} Preserved in MS UvDh line 69.

^{174.} <s'ṇp'vy> in MS UvDh line 70. Spelled with *m* also in SHT V, no. 1191 line 15.

^{175.} Akṣara smudged.

^{176.} The letter <ś> without diacritics in MS UvDh line 72.

^{177.} <s'tv'n'nč'> in MS UvDh line 73.

^{178.} Last akṣara not very clear.

^{179.} *pariśuddir* in MS UvDh line 74.

^{180.} This variant is not mentioned in the critical edition of the Sanskrit text. Instead we have *mama*. This reading is reflected also in MS UvDh line 75.

^{181.} The variant (testimonies ABDFI) in endnote 125 in the critical edition of the Sanskrit text reads *sarvadā*. Not in the main text. No variant *sadā* is mentioned in the critical edition. The reading *sarvadā* is reflected also in MS UvDh line 75 (*sarvada*). Interestingly, *sadā* is the reading in SHT V, no. 1191, line 16.

^{182.} <p'v'tw> in MS UvDh line 74.

^{183.} The second and third letter blurred.

^{184.} Wrong spelling <s'čv' k'ty> in MS UvDh lines 75–76.

^{185.} Reading somewhat uncertain. Mistake for *bha*.

- (R) pariṣuḍḍi ča¹⁸⁶ sarvatatagaṭa ča¹⁸⁷ man
 (T) p'ryšwtdy č¹⁸⁸ s'rv' t't'k'd' č' m'n
 (Br) pa ri šu ddhi śca¹⁸⁹ sa rva []¹⁹⁰ thā ga tā śca¹⁹¹ mā¹⁹²
 (Skt.) pariśuddhiś ca sarvatathāgatāś ca māṃ¹⁹³
 U 4639/b/

38 01

- (R) sanaśvasayantu¹⁹⁴ budya budya¹⁹⁵ siḍy-
 (T) s'n 'šv's'y'ntw¹⁹⁶ pwdy ' pwdy '197 syty
 (Br) sa mā śvā sa ya ntu bu¹⁹⁸ ddhya bu ddhya si¹⁹⁹ ddhya
 (Skt.) samāśvāsayantū budhya <budhya> sidhya

39 02

- (R) a siḍya bodaya bodaya vibodaya
 (T) ' syty ' pwd'y ' pwd'y ' vypwd'y '
 (Br) si²⁰⁰ ddhya bo²⁰¹ dha ya bo dha ya vi bo dha ya
 (Skt.) <sidhya> bodhaya <bodhaya> vibodhaya

40 03

- (R) vibodaya močaya močaya vimočaya
 (T) vypwd'y ' mwč'y ' mwč'y ' vymwč'y '
 (Br) vi bo dha ya mo²⁰² ca ya mo ca ya vi mo ca ya²⁰³
 (Skt.) <vibodhaya> mocaya <mocaya> vimocaya

41 04

- (R) vimočaya šoḍaya šoḍaya višoḍay-
 (T) vymwč'y ' šwt'y²⁰⁴ ' šwt'y '205 vyšwt'y²⁰⁶
 (Br) vi mo ca ya šo dha ya šo²⁰⁷ dha ya vi šo dha ya

186. In MS UvDh lines 77–79 additionally: *sarvatatagaṭasamaya-ādiṣṭana-ādiṣṭite*.

187. The correct Sandhi *sarvatatagaṭaśča* in MS UvDh lines 79–80.

188. <p'ryšwtdyšč'> in MS UvDh line 76 (with correct Sandhi).

189. Note the correct Sandhi here.

190. Akṣara lost due to a hole in the paper.

191. Note the correct Sandhi here, although the akṣara is slightly smudged.

192. The akṣara is slightly blurred. If there ever was an anusvāra nothing of it is seen anymore.

193. Sanskrit text according to testimonies CEG in endnote 129 in the critical edition.

194. *oom* follows in MS UvDh line 81 (= *om* in the Sanskrit text).

195. [*bu*]ḍye *budye* in U 4128 + U 4298 /r/1/ (followed immediately by *bodaya bodaya*). The Old Uyghur correspondence to Sanskrit *sidhya* <*sidhya*> perhaps in the lacuna in U 4128 + U 4298 /r/2/. The MS UvDh line 82 reads *siḍye siḍye budye*.

196. The diacritics of the letter <š> now a blurred to a single stroke. Variant spelling <s'n v'šy's'ndw> in MS UvDh line 81.

197. [...] *ddhye bu ddhye* in U 4128 + U 4298 /r/1/.

198. The *b* is not closed on the left side. There are more instances on the two pages.

199. Especially the right part of the letter *s* is misshapen.

200. Again the right part of the letter *s* is misshapen.

201. The vowel not as distinctly formed as in the next word.

202. The vowel not as distinctly formed as in the next word.

203. Although the damaged parallel U 4004 /r/3/ has *vimočaya* in Uyghur script, the Brāhmī part has only *vi mo*

ca.

204. The diacritics of the letter <š> now a blurred to a single stroke.

205. <šwd'y '> in U 4128 + U 4298 /r/3/ and in MS UvDh line 87.

206. <vyšwd'y '> in U 4128 + U 4298 /r/4/ and in MS UvDh line 87.

207. Not much ink here. Therefore the consonantal part of the akṣara nearly illegible. Only the right part of the

(Skt.) <vimocaya> śodhaya <śodhaya> viśodhaya

42 05

(R) a viśoḍaya samanta²⁰⁸ moḥaya moḥaya

(T) 'vyṣwt'y '209 s'm'nd' mwč'y 'mwč'y '

(Br) vi śo dha ya sa ma nta mo ca ya mo ca ya

(Skt.) <viśodhaya>²¹⁰ samantān mocaya <mocaya>²¹¹

U 4467

43 01

(R) samantaraśmipariśuddhe [sarvatatagaṭa-]²¹²

(T) s'm'nd' r'ṣmy p'ryṣwtdy²¹³ []

(Br) sa ma nta ra śmi pa ri śu ddhe []²¹⁴

(Skt.) samantaraśmipariśuddhe sarvatathāgata-

44 02

(R) hiriḍaya-aḍiṣṭana-a[diṣṭite²¹⁵ mudire]²¹⁶

(T) qyryt'y ' 'tyṣd'n' '[]

(Br) hṛ da yā dhi ṣṭhā nā dhi []²¹⁷

(Skt.) hṛdayādhīṣṭhānādhīṣṭhite mudre

45 03

(R) mudire m(a)hamudire m(a)hamudir[e m(a)hamudira]-²¹⁸

(T) mwdyry mq' mwdyry mq' mwdyr[]

(Br) []²¹⁹ dre ma hā mu dre ma hā / []²²⁰

(Skt.) <mudre> mahāmudre <mahāmudre>²²¹ mahāmudrā-

46 04

(R) manṭirapade svaha :

(T) m'ndyr'p'dy sv'q' :

(Br) ma ntra pa de svā hā

(Skt.) mantrapade²²² svāhā

47 05

(R) ::

vowel extant.

^{208.} The correct *samanṭan* in MS UvDh line 88.

^{209.} <vyṣwd'y '> in MS UvDh line 88.

^{210.} In SHT V, no. 1191, lines 17–19 with all “repetitions”: *buddhya buddhya siddhya siddhya bodhaya bodhaya m[o]caya [moca]ya vimocaya vimocaya śodhaya śodhaya viśodhaya viśodhaya*.

^{211.} With repetition *mocaya mocaya* in SHT V, no. 1191, line 19.

^{212.} Preserved in U 4733 + U 4129 /r/1/ and MS UvDh lines 91–92.

^{213.} Letter <ṣ> without diacritics in U 4128 + U 4298 /r/6/ and MS UvDh line 91.

^{214.} *sa rva ta thā ga ta* preserved in U 4129 /r/1/.

^{215.} *om* follows in the Sanskrit version (*oom* in MS UvDh line 94).

^{216.} Text in the lacuna preserved in U 4733 + U 4129 /r/2/, in MS UvDh lines 94–95 and in the JYG version.

^{217.} *dhi ṣṭhi te mu dre* preserved in U 4733 + U 4129 /r/2/.

^{218.} Preserved in U 4733 + U 4129 /r/3/.

^{219.} A hole in the paper caused the loss of the akṣara.

^{220.} *ma hā mu dra* preserved in U 4733 + U 4129 /r/3/.

^{221.} SHT V, no. 1191, line 20: *mudre mudre mahāmud[r]e mahāmudre*.

^{222.} Only *[ma]n[t](ra)pada* in SHT V, no. 1191, line 20.

Abbreviations and references

- ARIRIAB = *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University*.
- BT XXXVI = Yakup, Abdurishid, *Altugurische Aparimitāyus-Literatur und kleinere tantrische Texte*, Berliner Turfantexte XXXVI, Turnhout: Brepols 2016.
- BT XLVI = Moriyasu, Takao, *Corpus of Old Uighur Letters from the Eastern Silk Road*, Berliner Turfantexte XLVI, Turnhout: Brepols 2019.
- Hidas, Gergely, “*Uṣṇīṣavijayā-dhāraṇī*: The Complete Sanskrit Text Based on Nepalese Manuscripts,” in: *International Journal of Buddhist Thought & Culture* 30/2 (2020), 147–167.
- Hoernle, A. F. Rudolph, “The ‘Unknown Languages’ of Eastern Turkestan. II,” in: *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1911), 447–477.
- İsi, Hasan, *Eski Türkçe Tantrik bir metin: Uṣṇīṣa Vijayā Dhāraṇī Sūtra*, Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarik Yüksek Kurumu Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları 1420, Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu 2021.
- Kılıç Cengiz, Ayşe, “A Fragment of the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā Dhāraṇī* from Turfan Housed in the Museum für Asiatische Kunst in Berlin,” in: *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 74/4 (2021), 651–672.
- Linrothe, Rob, “Ushnīshavijayā and the Tangut Cult of the Stūpa at Yü-lin Cave 3,” in: *National Palace Museum Bulletin* 31/4–5 (September–December 1996), 1–25.
- Linrothe, Rob, “Xia Renzong and the Patronage of Tangut Buddhist Art: The Stūpa and Ushnīshavijayā Cult,” in: *Journal of Sung-Yuan Studies* 28 (1998), 91–121.
- Lokesh Chandra, “Comparative Iconography of the Goddess Uṣṇīṣavijayā,” in: *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 34/1–3 (1980), 125–137.
- Lundysheva, Olga & Maue, Dieter & Wille, Klaus, “Miscellanea in the Brāhmī Script from the Berezovsky and Krotkov Collections (IOM, RAS) with an Appendix: ВФ-4190,” in: *Written Monuments of the Orient* 7/1 (2021), 3–70.
- Lundysheva, O.V. & Turanskaya, A.A., “Ксилографическое издание Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī из Хара-Хото и его место в буддийской традиции,” in: *Письменные памятники Востока* 14/2 (2017), 47–66.
- Meinert, Carmen, “Creation of Tantric Sacred Spaces in Eastern Central Asia,” in: *Buddhism in Central Asia I: Patronage, Legitimation, Sacred Space, and Pilgrimage*, ed. Carmen Meinert & Henrik H. Sørensen, Leiden-Boston: Brill 2020, 244–271.
- Müller, F[riedrich] Max & Nanjio Bunyiu, *The Ancient Palm-Leaves Containing the Pragñā-Pāramitā-Hridaya-Sūtra and the Ushnīsha-Vigaya-Dhāraṇī with an Appendix by Georg Bühler*, Anecdota Oxoniensia: Texts, Documents, and Extracts Chiefly From Manuscripts in the Bodleian and Other Oxford Libraries, Aryan Series 3,1, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1884.
- Müller, F[riedrich] W[ilhelm] K[arl], *Uigurica II*, Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften; philosophisch-historische Classe 1910, 3, Berlin: Verlag der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1911.
- pl. plate
/r/ recto
- SHT V = Sander, Lore & Waldschmidt, Ernst, *Sanskriithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden. Teil 5: Die Katalognummern 1015–1201 und 63 vorweggenommene höhere Nummern*, Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland X, 5, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner 1985.
- Uzunkaya, Uğur, “A Fragment of Old Ughyur *Uṣṇīṣavijayā-nāma-dhāraṇī* from the Berlin Turfan Collection,” in: *ERDEM* 75 (December 2018), 223–250.
- VOHD XIII, 19 = Yakup, Abdurishid & Knüppel, Michael, *Altürkische Handschriften Teil 11: Die uigurischen Blockdrucke der Berliner Turfansammlung. Teil 1: Tantrische Texte*, Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland XIII, 19, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner 2007.
- VOHD XIII, 23 = Yakup, Abdurishid, *Altürkische Handschriften Teil 15: Die uigurischen Blockdrucke der Berliner Turfansammlung. Teil 3: Stabreimdichtungen, Kalendarisches, Bilder, unbestimmte Fragmente und Nachträge*, Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland XIII, 23, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner 2009.
- Yuyama Akira, “An Enlarged Version of the Uṣṇīṣa-Vijayā Dhāraṇī: The Text Transmitted in the Yüan Period,” in: ARIRIAB XV: 2011 (2012a), 195–200.
- Yuyama Akira, “元代流布佛頂尊勝陀羅尼考—新出西夏流傳本に關連して—,” in: ARIRIAB XV: 2011 (2012b), 201–208 [“Remarks on the *Uṣṇīṣa-Vijayā Dhāraṇī* Transmitted in the Yüan Period — With Reference to the Newly Recovered Hsi-hsia Version —”].
- Zieme, Peter, “An Uigur Monasterial Letter from Toyoq,” in: 内陸アジア言語の研究 / *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages* 10 (1995), 1–7 (pl. I).
- Zieme, Peter, Review of Yakup, A. & Knüppel, M., *Altürkische Handschriften. Teil 11. Die uigurischen Blockdrucke der Berliner Turfansammlung. Teil 1: Tantrische Texte*, Stuttgart 2007; Yakup, A., *Altürkische Handschriften. Teil 12. Die uigurischen Blockdrucke der Berliner Turfansammlung. Teil 2:*

Apokryphen, Mahāyāna-Sūtren, Erzählungen, magische Texte, Kommentare und Kolophone, Stuttgart 2008; Yakup, A., *Alttürkische Handschriften. Teil 15. Die uigurischen Blockdrucke der Berliner Turfansammlung. Teil 3. Stabreimdichtungen, Kalendarisches, Bilder, unbestimmte Fragmente und Nachträge*, Stuttgart 2009, in: *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, 106/3 (2011), 224–228.